1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 Plaintiff 5 CRIMINAL 05-191 (HL) 6 v. 7 JORGE LUIS MATOS-BURGOS, 8 Defendant 9 10 MEMORANDUM ORDER DIRECTED TO OMNIBUS MOTION FOR DISCOVERY 11 AND DISCLOSURE 12 At the pretrial conference, parties were informed that I would rule on the 13 Omnibus Motion filed on July 6, 2005, Docket No. 16. I will address the requests 14 1.5 specifically or globally as I deem appropriate. Rulings directed to the omnibus 16 motion will refer to the corresponding numeration in the motion if applicable. 17 SECTION A: DISCOVERY: RULE 16, FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 18 The Rule 16 motions are granted but only in strict compliance with the Rule. 19 The motion is otherwise denied. This assumes the United States has given the 20 21 defendant all Rule 16 material. If any additional Rule 16 material is discovered, the 22 United States is to notify the court how, specifically and not generically, the Rule 16 23 request has been further complied with. 24 CO-CONSPIRATOR STATEMENT: RULE 801(d)(2)(E), FEDERAL RULES 25 EVIDENCE. 26 The request for co-conspirator statements is denied. This request does not fall 27 within the purview of Rule 16(a)(1)(A). See <u>United States v. Burns</u>, 15 F.3d 211, 28

1 CRIMINAL 05-191 (HL) 2 2 214 n.1 (1st Cir. 1994); In re United States, 834 F.2d 283, 286-87 (2d Cir. 1987); 3 4 United States v. Orr, 825 F.2d 1537, 1541 (11th Cir. 1987); United States v. 5 Roberts, 811 F.2d 257, 258-59 (4th Cir. 1987); United States v. Bennett, 158 F.R.D. 6 482, 484 (D. Kan. 1994); United States v. Stroop, 121 F.R.D. 269, 276 (E.D.N.C. 7 1988). 8 9 II. DOCUMENTS AND TANGIBLE OBJECTS 10 Granted as covered by Rule 16 and Brady; otherwise denied. 11 III. REPORTS OF EXAMINATIONS AND TESTS 12 Granted as covered by Rule 16 and Brady; otherwise denied. 13 IV. SEARCHES, MAIL COVER, PEN REGISTERS, TELEPHONE TOLL RECORDS, 14 VIDEO, TELESCOPIC OR PHYSICAL SURVEILLANCE 15 Granted as covered by Rule 16; otherwise denied. 16 V. WIRETAPPING, EAVESDROPPING AND CONSENSUAL RECORDINGS 17 Denied except that consensual recordings of defendant falling within Rule 16 18 19 discovery will be provided. 20 VI. REQUEST FOR DISCLOSURE OF EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE 21 The request for disclosure is granted as discovered. See United States v. 22 Bagley, 473 U.S. 667, 675 (1985); United States v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97, 104 (1976); 23 24 Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150, 154 (1972); Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 25 87 (1963); United States v. Sepúlveda, 15 F.3d 1161, 1177-78 (1st Cir. 1993); 26 United States v. Osorio, 929 F.2d 753, 757-58 (1st Cir. 1991); United States v. 27 28

CRIMINAL 05-191 (HL)

3

3

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

25 26

27

28

Pandozzi, 878 F.2d 1526, 1529 (1st Cir. 1989); United States v. Ingraldi, 793 F.2d 408, 411 (1st Cir. 1986).

The United States has an on-going obligation to comply with this discovery order as information is made known to it, except where 3500 material is involved and not overriden by Brady considerations. The United States should have provided this information as applicable by June 25, 2005, according the court's scheduling order.

VII. REQUEST FOR SPECIFIC KYLES AND BRADY INFORMATION

Denied or moot as applicable, except if covered by Brady.

VIII MISCELLANEOUS REQUESTS FOR GOVERNMENT'S WITNESS LIST

The defense has requested a list of the government's witnesses and their addresses. See United States v. Murphy, 480 F.2d 256, 259 (1st Cir. 1973). The request is denied. See United States v. Sclamo, 578 F.2d 888, 890 (1st Cir. 1978); <u>United States v. Panzardi-Alvarez</u>, 646 F. Supp. 1158, 1160 (D.P.R. 1986); cf. United States v. Barrett, 766 F.2d 609, 617 (1st Cir.), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 923 (1985).

SECTIONS B & C: REQUEST FOR EARLY DISCLOSURE OF JENCKS MATERIAL & PRESERVATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT NOTES AND MEMOS

The United States will transcribe grand jury witness testimonies in preparation for production under 18 U.S.C. § 3500 if applicable. The request to preserve all law enforcement notes is granted and all rough notes and memoranda are to be preserved in the event they are needed as 3500 material, or needed for in

CRIMINAL 05-191 (HL) 4

camera inspection. See United States v. Houlihan, 92 F.3d 1271, 1288-89 (1^{st} Cir.

1996). The request for early disclosure of Jencks is most since the court has directed that all Jencks be given one day before trial.

SECTION D: REQUEST FOR NOTICE TO INTRODUCE EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE 404(b)

The United States is to produce all Federal Rule of Evidence 404(b) material as it becomes aware of the same.

SECTION E: MOTION IN LIMINE CONCERNING IMPEACHMENT EVIDENCE

Denied.

SECTION F: RULE 12(b)(4)(B), PREVIOUSLY RULE 12(d)(2), FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

The defense requests notice of any evidence that the government intends to produce at trial that may arguably be subject to a motion to suppress, citing as authority Rule 12(d)(2), now 12(b)(4)(B), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. At the conference, the United States informed that it had provided all discovery to which the defendant is entitled under Rule 16, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, including all exculpatory evidence, of which there is allegedly none.

Assuming that the government has complied with the spirit and letter of Rule 16, I will not direct the United States to designate that evidence which the defendants may object to under Rule 12(b)(3)(C). See United States v. De la Cruz-Paulino, 61 F.3d 986, 993 (1st Cir. 1995). This assumes that the government's notice of June 23 complies with the designation requirement of Rule 12(b)(4)(B),

Case 3:05-cr-00191-HL-JA Document 24 Filed 07/12/05 Page 5 of 5

CRIMINAL 05-191 (HL) Fed. R. Crim. P. Again, all Rule 16 material has arguably been tendered to the defendant. The defendant is thus placed on notice that the United States may use such evidence in its case-in-chief. Cf. United States v. Lanoue, 71 F.3d 966, 971-79 $(1^{st} Cir. 1995).$ SO ORDERED At San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 12th day of July, 2005. S/JUSTO ARENAS Chief United States Magistrate Judge